

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

09/994,678

**Applicant(s)**

HOROBIN, MARK W.

**Examiner**

Charlotte Baker

**Art Unit**

2625

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kimberly A. Williams.(3) Robert Hutter.(2) Charlotte Baker.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 22 May 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,6 and 17.

Identification of prior art discussed: Chao (US 6404517).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



**KIMBERLY WILLIAMS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Hutter emphasized that the marks on Chao were not rules nor on the edge of the paper. The examiner interpreted the marks to meet the claimed input sheet defining a rule relative to the first and second edge and the marks were used to correct skew thereby interpreted as a rule. However, the examiner indicated that claim 6 would be allowable if put in independent form and included into claim 17. Mr. Hutter will consider putting claim 6 into the independent claims which would not require further consideration and/or search .